

REMARKS

Claims 1-76, 78-80, and 82-99 are pending in this application. The final Office Action mailed November 18, 2004 rejected claims 1-76, 78-80, and 82-99. Claim 82 has been amended in the present response for no other reason than to correct an informality, and no new matter has been added by this amendment. The pending claims are not otherwise amended in this response. For the reasons discussed in detail below, Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentable over the references cited by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application to issue.

Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected claims 1-14, 16-21, 23-25, 29-30, 36, 39-40, 42, 48-50, 53-57, 61-63, 65-70, 73-76, 78-80, 84-89, and 94-97 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,420,866 to Wasilewski ("Wasilewski") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,161,193 to Lampson et al. ("Lampson"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Each of the independent claims (claims 1, 17, 36, 53, 61, 67, 73, 78, 86, and 97) includes an element that refers to selective encryption of a portion of data based on the format of that same data portion. For example, claim 1 includes "an encrypter configured to determine if the first portion of the data is to be encrypted based on a format of the first portion of the data, and if it is to be encrypted, to encrypt the first portion of the data." While the Office Action recognizes that Wasilewski fails to disclose these inventive elements, the Office Action contends that encryption of a portion of data based on the format of the portion is taught by Lampson, citing specifically to column 14, lines 44-68 of the reference.

However, Lampson merely discusses three different formats of transmitted *packets* based on the presence (or absence) of particular fields within transmitted packet's headers. It does not describe looking at the format of the **first portion of the data to determine if the first portion of the data is to be encrypted**. Rather, as described in Lampson, "the parsing of an outbound or loopback packet begins with two preliminary tests on packet request header bytes at the beginning


allowable for at least substantially the same reasons presented above with respect to the independent claims and should be allowed to issue.

CONCLUSION

By the foregoing explanations, Applicants believe that this response has responded fully to all of the concerns expressed in the Office Action, and believes that it has placed each of the pending claims in condition for immediate allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. Should any further aspects of the application remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Dated: January 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Jamie L. Wiegand
Registration No.: 52,361
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 5257
New York, New York 10150-5257
(206) 262-8900
(212) 753-6237 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant